

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **19 December 2005** the Examiner reviewed Claims 1-21. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Santhanam (USPN 5,704,053, hereinafter “Santhanam”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being anticipated by Santhanam. Applicant respectfully points out that Santhanam teaches inserting prefetch instructions into the code based on **estimated latency** (see Santhanam, col. 6, line 18 to col. 8, line 61).

In contrast, the present invention inserts prefetch instructions based on the **ratio of outstanding prefetches and the number of prefetch streams** (see page 15, lines 21-23 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it allows for a larger number of outstanding prefetches if there are multiple prefetch streams. Note that if there are too many outstanding prefetches for a single prefetch stream, many of the outstanding prefetches are likely to be redundant or inaccurate. There is nothing within Santhanam, either explicit or implicit, which suggests inserting prefetch instructions based on the ratio of outstanding prefetches and the number of prefetch streams.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention inserts prefetch instructions based on the ratio of outstanding prefetches and the number of prefetch streams. These amendments find support on page 15, lines 21-23 of the instant application. Dependent claim 14 has been amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-14, which depend upon claim 8,

and claims 16-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 23 January 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1663
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com